



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/124,438 09/22/93 SULLIVAN

J 04249.000203

EXAMINER
SCHWADRON, R

18M2/0125

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT AND DUNNER
1300 I STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3315

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1806

DATE MAILED: 01/25/94

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☒ Responsive to communication filed on 12-16-93 9-22-97 ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152. |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 27, 29, 30-39 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims 31-36 are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☒ Claims 1-26, 28 have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 27, 29, 30, 37-39 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with Informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).
10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
12. ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit 1806

15. Newly submitted claims 31-36 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:

I. Claims 27,29,30,37-39 are drawn to an antivenin composition, classified in Class 530, subclass 389.8.

II. Claims 31-36 are drawn to a method of treatment with an antivenin composition, classified in Class 424, subclass 85.8.

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (M.P.E.P. § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the antivenin composition can be used for the immunopurification of snake venom of the type recognized by said antivenin antisera.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 31-36 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b) and M.P.E.P. § 821.03.

16. Claims 27,29,30,37-39 are under consideration. Claims 20-26,28 have been cancelled. Claims 27,29,30 have been amended.

17. Applicants have still not updated the status of US patent application 07/593,271 in paragraph 7 of the rule 62 continuation application filed 9/22/93.

18. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The following title is suggested: Antivenin composition containing F(ab) fragments.

RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS

19. The objection to the specification and rejection of claims 20-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as detailed in paragraph 18, sections A,B,C of the previous Office Action is withdrawn in light of applicants arguments, the cancellation of claims 20-26,28 and the amending of claims 27,29,30.

Art Unit 1806

20. The rejection of claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as the disclosure is enabling only for claims for the reasons specified in paragraph 20 of the previous Office Action is withdrawn in view of applicants arguments.

21. The rejection of claims 20-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as detailed in paragraph 21 of the previous Office Action is withdrawn in light of applicants arguments, the cancellation of claims 20-26,28 and the amending of claims 27,29,30.

22. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

23. The rejection of claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Sullivan et al. as enunciated in paragraph 22 of the previous Office Action is maintained. The rejection of claim 22 is withdrawn in view of the cancellation of said claim. Applicants arguments have been considered and deemed not persuasive. The claim reads on an antivenin composition which contains IgG antibodies and binds to venom from species of the Croatus genus. The process used to produce said antibody, including the original source of the antibody from which the product is derived are simply irrelevant in this product claim. Sullivan et al. teaches the antivenin of the instant invention (see entire document).

24. The rejection of claims 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Sullivan et al. in view of Stanworth et al. as enunciated in paragraph 24 of the previous Office Action is withdrawn in light of applicants arguments and the cancellation of claim 28.

25. The rejection of claims 20,21,23-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Smith et al. in view of Sullivan et al. as enunciated in paragraph 25 of the previous Office Action is withdrawn in light of the cancellation of claims 20,21,23-26.

OTHER REJECTIONS

Art Unit 1806

26. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

27. Claims 27, 29, 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Sullivan et al. in view of Coulter et al. and Smith et al.

The claims are drawn to antivenin compositions consisting of F(ab) fragments. Sullivan et al. teach purified antivenin polyvalent antibodies derived from horse hyperimmune antisera against venom of the *Crotalus* genus (see *Methods* section, pages 185-187). These antibodies are predominantly IgG(T), because that is the predominant isotype found in hyperimmune horse antisera. A routineer would have used the procedure of Sullivan et al. to produce purified antivenin antibodies against any desired venom. A routineer would have immunized horses to produce said hyperimmune antisera because this is the art recognized procedure for producing antivenin. Sullivan et al. do not teach a F(ab) containing antivenin. Coulter et al. teaches a method for producing F(ab) fragments that are free of Fc (see abstract). A routineer would have assayed for Fc by immunoelectrophoresis using anti-Fc antibodies or any other art recognized procedure. Smith et al. teaches the advantages of Fab fragments for the neutralization and clearance of toxic substances in therapeutic applications (see page 393, first paragraph, *Discussion* section). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have produced antivenin compositions consisting of F(ab) fragments because Sullivan et al. teach purified antivenin polyvalent antibodies derived from horse hyperimmune antisera against venom of the *Crotalus* genus, a

Art Unit 1806

routineer would have used the procedure of Sullivan et al. to produce purified antivenin antibodies against any desired venom, Coulter et al. teaches a method for producing F(ab) fragments that are free of Fc, and Smith et al. teaches the advantages of F(ab) fragments for the neutralization and clearance of toxic substances in therapeutic applications. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do the aforementioned because Smith et al. teaches that,

"Relatively rapid clearance of Fab fragments can be used to advantage when the objective is rapid neutralization and clearance of a toxic substance, and purified sheep digoxin specific Fab fragments have been utilized clinically for the reversal of advanced digoxin intoxication. This therapeutic approach is based on similar binding properties and the postulated lesser immunogenicity of Fab compared with IgG. For urgent clinical situations such as life threatening digitalis-toxic cardiac arrhythmias, the present study indicates that Fab has another important advantage-more rapid and extensive distribution to its presumed site of action in the interstitial space." (page 393). In addition, Sullivan et al. teach that reducing the immunogenicity of polyvalent horse antivenin is an important goal, due to immune reactions that limit the clinical efficacy of antivenin preparations which contain only partially purified hyperimmune horse antisera (see page 185, first paragraph). One of ordinary skill in the art would have a reasonable expectation of success because antivenin containing purified antibodies was known in the art, methods for preparing F(ab) fragments were known in the art, and the clinical advantages of F(ab) containing preparations for the neutralization of toxic substances was known in the art.

28. No claim is allowed.

29. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 180 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 180 via the PTO Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The CMI Fax Center telephone number is (703) 308-4227.

30. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ron Schwadron whose telephone number is (703) 308-4680. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group 180 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Serial No. 08/124438

-6-

Art Unit 1806

Ron Schwadron

Ron Schwadron, Ph.D
January 24, 1994

Christina Chan

CHRISTINA Y. CHAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1800